

## REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-24, and 26-41 are pending and under consideration. In the non-final Office Action of April 10, 2006, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Rejected claims 1-9, 11-24, and 26-41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Simonson, et al.*, “Version augmented URIs for reference permanence via an Apache module design” (“*Simonson*”).
- B.) Rejected claims 1-9, 11-24, and 26-41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Gurijala, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,601,090)* (“*Gurijala*”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and address the Examiner’s disposition below.

- A.) Rejected claims 1-9, 11-24, and 26-41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Simonson, et al.*, “Version augmented URIs for reference permanence via an Apache module design” (“*Simonson*”).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Applicants’ independent claims 1, 15, 16, 30, 31, 37, 38, 39, and 40 each claim a network address that is contained within a document or web page. These claims also claim that the network address includes a timer value/time stamp and a calculated value, which is based on the timer value/time stamp. In an illustrative example, the network address may be a URL that includes a timer value, such as a date and time, and a calculated value that is based on the date and time.

This is clearly unlike *Simonson*, which fails to disclose or suggest incorporating a timer value/time stamp and a calculated value, which is based on the timer value/time stamp, in a network address that is within a document or web page. The Examiner argues that *Simonson* discloses a URI that includes both a timer value and a calculated value, which is based on the timer value. *Office Action of 4/10/2006*, page 3. Applicants disagree. Nowhere does *Simonson* teach a URI that includes both a timer value and a calculated value, which is based on the timer value. Instead, *Simonson* merely teaches appending a URI with either a timer value or a version number. Thus, for at least this reason, *Simonson* fails to anticipate each and every element of Applicants’ claimed invention. Further, compared to Applicants’ network address, *Simonson*’s URI includes less time-related information and is therefore less advantageous.

Further, unlike Applicants' claimed calculated value, *Simonson's* version number is not a calculated value based on a timer value/time stamp. *Simonson's* version number is merely a version number, such as version 1, 1.1, 2, or 3. Nowhere does *Simonson* suggest that its version number is calculated based on a timer value in a network address. Instead, *Simonson* merely teaches that it can cross reference date value, which is in its URI, to a version number after a URI has been received by a server. The version number is not based on the date value. For at least this additional reason, *Simonson* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 15, 16, 30, 31, 37, 38, 39, and 40.

Claims 2-9, 11-14, 17-24, 26-29, 32-36, and 41 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 16, or 40 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 16, and 40 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

B.) Rejected claims 1-9, 11-24, and 26-41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Gurijala, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,601,090) ("Gurijala")*.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

As discussed above, Applicants' independent claims 1, 15, 16, 30, 31, 37, 38, 39, and 40 each claim subject matter relating to a document/web page that includes a network address. The network address includes a timer value/time stamp and a calculated value, which is based on the timer value/time stamp.

This is clearly unlike *Gurijala*, which fails to disclose or suggest a document/web page that includes a network address, and fails to disclose or suggest incorporating a timer value/time stamp and a calculated value, which is based on the timer value/time stamp, into the network address. The Examiner cites several passages from *Gurijala* (4:8-18, 5:51-65, 6:34-40, and 8:48-57) to support the Examiner's argument that *Gurijala* teaches a document or web page that includes a network address. However, as clearly evident from reading these passages, these passages fail to discuss a document or web page that includes a network address. Instead, these passages merely discuss that an object is identified by a URI and that a cache name server (CNS) can receive URI that identifies an object that has been received by a web client and a time stamp for when the object was received by the web client. Nowhere does *Gurijala* suggest that the object includes a network address.

Further, *Gurijala* fails to disclose or suggest that a network address in a document/web page includes a timer value/time stamp and a calculated value that is based on the timer value/time stamp. As discussed above, *Gurijala* teaches that URIs that identify network objects can be stored at a cache name server in a database. However, *Gurijala*'s URIs are not included in its network objects. Further, *Gurijala*'s URIs do not include a time stamp/timer value and a calculated value. In fact, nowhere does *Gurijala* suggest that its URI can include a time stamp/timer value and a calculated value. Although *Gurijala* keeps track of the age of a network object, *Gurijala* does not store the network object's age in a URI. Thus, for at least this additional reason, *Gurijala* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 15, 16, 30, 31, 37, 38, 39, and 40.

Claims 2-9, 11-14, 17-24, 26-29, 32-36, and 41 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 16, or 40 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 16, and 40 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-9, 11-24, and 26-41 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher P. Rauch/ (Reg. No. 45,034)  
Christopher P. Rauch  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P. O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
Telephone (312) 876 8000  
Customer No. 26263